

Salt Management Strategy (SaMS)

Traditional BMP Workgroup

First Meeting

September 13, 2018

Proposed Outcomes for Each Meeting

Three meetings are envisioned for each workgroup, although a 4th meeting may be necessary for some workgroups to complete their work. The anticipated outcomes for each meeting are:

- 1st Meeting:
 - Identify the scope of the recommendations the group will prepare.
 - Identify process to develop recommendations.
 - Begin work on proposed topics by identifying tasks/research to be conducted in preparation for next meeting.
- 2nd Meeting:
 - Report on tasks/research conducted prior to this meeting.
 - Identify any final research needs/other workgroup coordination necessary to finalize recommendations.
 - Begin brainstorming recommendations.
 - Prepare for a workgroup status update at the 3rd SAC meeting.
 - Prior to the next meeting, begin consolidating any identified recommendations into a draft document.
- 3rd Meeting:
 - Report on any final tasks/research conducted prior to this meeting.
 - Discuss proposed recommendations and draft document, if recommendations are prepared at this point.
 - Finalize recommendations.

Membership Roles and Expectations

Roles

Workgroup membership types are identified as follows:

- Primary: Organization representative
- Alternate: Organization alternate(s)
- Adviser: Experts in the field who may offer comments on our process/recommendations
- Follower: Others who desire to stay informed of specific workgroups' progress

There will be one workgroup "Primary" member from any single organization. This workgroup member will be the primary representative and generally serve as spokesperson for the organization in workgroup meetings.

Where an organization has more than one person interested to participate in a given workgroup, others (beyond the "Primary") are considered "Alternates." Alternates can attend all workgroup meetings, and would serve as the "Primary" in the member's absence.

Alternates should limit their speaking in meetings to ensure that primary members who wish to contribute are able to. However, alternates should not feel unable to contribute important facts and perspectives that will contribute to the workgroups deliberations. Rather, they should be alert to avoid limiting the participation of other primary workgroup members (i.e., smaller organizations/individuals).

Expectations

To foster efficient substantive dialogue in workgroup meetings, members are expected to review materials DEQ sends in advance of meetings and be ready to provide feedback for discussion during meetings. DEQ will aim to send materials out at least one-week ahead of the meeting date. To ensure accurate meeting records, members are also asked to review and provide comments on meeting summaries sent by DEQ following each workgroup meeting.

Workgroup Purpose

To address the following SaMS Objectives:

- No. 2: Collaboratively develop a suite of best practices to minimize the negative effects of deicing/anti-icing salts.
- No. 4: Explore funding opportunities, operational cost savings, and broader incentives, such as certification requirements/tort reform, to support implementation

Workgroup Meeting Goals

1. First Meeting:
 - a. Identify the scope of the recommendations the workgroup will prepare
 - b. Identify a process for developing the recommendations
 - c. Begin work on proposed topics for recommendations
2. Second Meeting:
 - a. Finalize scope of the workgroup by finalizing the topics/areas that recommendations will be developed for
 - b. Identify final research needs/other workgroup coordination necessary to finalize recommendations
3. Third/Fourth Meeting(s):
 - a. Finalize the recommendations

Scope of the Workgroup

DEQ's Proposal

Discuss and offer recommendations on the following, such as but not limited to:

- Best management practices (below are suggestions)
 - Equipment Calibration
 - Integrate liquids
 - Reduce bounce and scatter of salt
 - Anti-ice before events
 - Use ground speed controllers
 - Upgrades to equipment
 - winter maintenance plans
 - Training
 - Better storage
 - Tailor product usage and application rates based on pavement temperatures and conditions
 - Refine application rate charts and test lower rates for effectiveness
 - Remove excess salt after storm events
 - Alternative deicer/anti-ice products/approaches
- Funding sources
 - Funding options to support implementation
- Incentives opportunities
 - Possible financial incentives to support implementation
 - Potential non-financial incentives (e.g., personnel)

SAC Feedback

Feedback provided through the survey:

- “Although other descriptive practices maybe developed or included that are not listed as this group goes through this exercise. As well the scope may increase pending on the research and information that develops from the group.”
- “Continuous process improvement as an institutionalized requirement to keep reducing unnecessary application of salt or other pollutants by Gov’t agencies and contractors.”
- “Looking outside the box for BMP where changes have already been implemented successfully. It will be important to understand how a program was structured in another state or city that has resulted in improved practices. It will be helpful to be able to understand how other programs measured success of their efforts and whether the targets were achieved. An understanding of how to measure the success of any efforts should be determined early on in the process.”
- “Looking outside the box for BMP where changes have already been implemented successfully. It will be important to understand how a program was structured in another state or city that has resulted in improved practices. It will be helpful to be able to understand how other programs measured success of their efforts and whether the targets were achieved. An understanding of how to measure the success of any efforts should be determined early on in the process.”
- “As a general principal, I'd like to see mention of institutionalizing Continuous Process Improvement (CPI), perhaps alongside each mention of BMP's, to emphasize the point that there is no one-time step to take on best practices, but, rather, it takes a continuous effort to keep improving. Quality Management Systems (QMS) references such as ISO 18091:2014 and CMMI are useful for describing how CPI should be approached. It could be that QMS is a better acronym to use than CPI in this area, or other vocabulary: I'm not wedded to a particular label for the concept. ”

Resources To Consider For Developing Our Recommendations

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency:

- Winter Maintenance Assessment Tool (WMAt):
[https://stormwater.pca.state.mn.us/index.php?title=Winter_Maintenance_Assessment_tool_\(WMAt\)](https://stormwater.pca.state.mn.us/index.php?title=Winter_Maintenance_Assessment_tool_(WMAt))

Clear Roads:

- “Manual of Environmental Best Practices for Snow and Ice Control”:
http://clearroads.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/Manual_ClearRoads_13-01_FINAL.pdf
- “Manual of Environmental Best Practices for Road Salt in Winter Maintenance”:
http://clearroads.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/0537_2015-Clear-Roads-Best-Practice-Guide-WEB.pdf

Maryland’s Salt Management Plan:

- “Maryland Statewide Salt Management Plan”:
http://roads.maryland.gov/oom/statewide_salt_management_plan.pdf

The Salt institute:

- “Safe and Sustainable Snowfighting Handbook”: <http://www.saltinstitute.org/road/snowfighting/>

The Snow & Ice Management Association – SIMA:

- A number of resources including Best Practices Checklists, Best Practices in Snow Service Procurement, Best Practices Guidelines for Sustainable Slat Use, etc.: <http://www.sima.org/bestpractices> (note, you will have to enter your information to access the files, but the resources are free and accessible to anyone)

Guiding Questions:

Welcome and Introduction

1. Provide a brief introduction of yourself, including the organization you represent and your interest in participating on this workgroup.
2. Are there any questions or concerns on the roles and expectations for members, alternates and DEQ and ICRPB as summarized above in this handout?

Purpose and Scope

3. Is the scope, as outlined in this handout, adequate to address your interests and/or needs?
4. What, for you, will be the most useful outcome from this effort?

Content Development

5. Who is the audience we are targeting with our recommendations? Do we want to make audience specific recommendations?
6. From your perspective, which BMPs warrant the greatest attention in this strategy?
7. Are there any topics / BMPs that:
 - a. Are listed in the materials that you feel should not be addressed by this workgroup?
 - b. You feel are missing from this effort and should be included/explored?
8. What level of detail do we want to dedicate to the evaluation of each BMP?
9. Considering our responses on audiences, BMPs important to cover and not cover, and the manner in which we will explore each topic, what are the specific topics we want to focus on?
10. Should we tackle each of these topics in a specific order and if so, what order?
11. Recommendations on BMPs:
 - a. Should we review the available BMPs and discuss the pros/cons of each?
 - b. There are a number of publications that already identify a suite of BMPs. Should we promote their use (i.e. make them more accessible and adoptable, etc.) and if so, how?
 - c. How should we break up the existing BMPs for research between this meeting and the next?
 - d. To ensure the next meeting is productive, what material should be prepared and/or sufficiently researched in advance to better inform discussions during that meeting?
12. How will this group work on each task? Should we all work on a topic and discuss, or should we assign a few people to each and report back to the workgroup for discussion?
13. What is the desired product from this workgroup's effort? At a minimum, we need a written set of recommendations. But, is there anything else? Pamphlet? Database of recommended BMPs?

Workgroup Communications and Decision-Making

14. Should input from other workgroups or experts or audiences be solicited? If so, at what point do we reach out and to what extent should their input be used in the development of recommendations?
15. Is there any critical expertise needed to develop recommendations that our members do not bring to the table?
16. What is the best method to coordinate with other workgroups on our status and share any relevant information? At what frequency should this coordination occur?
17. How will this group seek consensus and make decisions?
18. Communication between meetings
 - a. Are you agreeable to DEQ sending a day after the meeting a follow-up survey to gather any additional thoughts that arise?
 - b. We recommend limiting use of “reply-all” in email correspondences to be sensitive to the level of email traffic that its use generates. DEQ can serve as recipient of any information to be shared and compile to send out to the group. Are there concerns with this approach?

Next Steps

19. What are the tasks we want (or have decided) to work on in preparation for our next meeting?
20. Volunteers to work on these tasks?
 - a. Fact-finding/research, Follow-up communications among members/outside experts, Drafting language, etc.
21. Currently, the next meeting is anticipated to occur no earlier than December or January, depending on schedules.
 - a. Will this timeframe work?
 - b. Any known timeframes (conferences, etc.) that we should avoid?
 - c. Is there a preferred time of day?
 - d. Will three (3) meetings, including this one, be sufficient?
 - e. For the next meeting do we want to stick with 2.5 hours, or extend it to accommodate the list of anticipated outcomes for that meeting?